Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch (471-488)

Rafał KOSIŃSKI (Białystok)

The figure of Peter the Fuller is not very widely known. Despite his three times as bishop of Antioch in the years decisive for the outcome of the Chalcedonian controversy, there are no writings preserved that could be unquestionably attributed to him,[1] whereas the contemporary sources devote relatively scant attention to his person. Peter was a man, however, who had initiated one of the serious conflicts of the era of Chalcedonian disputes – the conflict over the *Trishagion* hymn. It seems to be needful, therefore, to analyze the events of his life on the basis of the extant sources. The body of these sources can be divided, in general, into two significant traditions: one of them descends from Theodore Lector, while the other from the tradition of the Roman see.

Theodore Lector and the related tradition

The work of Theodore Lector was written during the time he had been at Euchaita, where he accompanied Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople deposed in 511. His *History* encompassed the whole of the history of the Church and was composed of three parts, of which the last one is his own proper work continued until the death of Anastasius in 518. It has only been preserved in parts that have survived to our time, as excerpts from *Epitome*, from the beginning of the 7th century. Theodore was a fervent Chalcedonian and his dogmatic views make him glorify in his work the defenders of the Council of Chalcedon, while very critically portraying the adversaries, including Peter the Fuller.[2] Later authors had readily drawn on Theodore's work, including, first of all, Theophanes the Confessor, Victor of Tunnuna, and the anonymous author of the *Synodicon Vetus.*

---

[1] Although M. van Esbroeck, *The Memra on the Parrot by Isaac of Antioch,* Journal of Theological Studies 47 (1996) 469 believes that some anti-Chalcedonian Armenian texts contain quotes from Peter's letters, there is no direct evidence available to support this claim.

[2] Cf. G. Ch. Hansen, *Einleitung*, in: Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte, herausgegeben von G. Ch. Hansen, Berlin 1971, IX-XXXIX; P. Nautin, *Théodore Lecteur et sa «Réunion de différentes histoire» de l'Église*, Revue des Études Byzantines 52 (1994) 213-243; M. Whitby, *The Church Historians and Chalcedon*, in: Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century A. D., ed. G. Marasco, Leiden – Boston 2003, 467-472; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451-491). De l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie,* Roma 2006, 549-552 and 622-648. Edition: *Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte*, herausgegeben von G. Ch. Hansen, Berlin 1971.

Victor of Tunnuna was one of the six African bishops summoned to Constantinople by the emperor Justinian. As a steadfast Chalcedonian, he refused, in 543, to denounce the so-called Three Chapters, and was placed by the emperor first at a monastery in Egypt, and later in Constantinople. Very few facts about him are known from the period after Justinian's death. During his stay in Constantinople, he had written a Latin chronicle from the Creation to AD 566, of which only the last part, from the year 444 on, has survived. Victor presents a very concise account of the events connected with Peter the Fuller, and as he had drawn primarily on Theodore Lector's work, he also shared his negative assessment of the Antiochene bishop.[3]

Theophanes (died 817/818) was the founder and a monk at the Megas Agros monastery on Mt. Sigriane. His work is a chronicle spanning the period from AD 285 to 813. Attempting to verify the sources which may have been used by Theophanes is a complicated issue. In all certainty, however, the fundamental source for the period of Zeno's reign had been the history by Theodore Lector, whose *Epitome* was, to an extent, recreated from Theophanes' work. The chronicler follows therefore Theodore's criticism in his own evaluation of Peter the Fuller.[4]

The *Synodicon Vetus* is an anonymous concise account of the church synods encompassing the period from the apostolic times to AD 886, finished at the final deposition of the Constantinopolitan patriarch Photius. The source had been written probably shortly afterwards, at the turn of the 9th and 10th centuries. The author had drawn on various sources, and in the section referring to the second half of the 5th century, he used the information primarily from Theodore Lector's work, and, in a lesser degree, from the chronicle of Theophanes. He probably also had access to the apocryphal letters to Peter the Fuller, concerning his addition to the *Trishagion* hymn.[5]

In the tradition of Theodore Lector as well, there are also fragments from the *Ecclesiastical History* by John Diacrinomenos, which has not survived in full, and written at the request of his uncle Sylvianus, bishop of the Himyarites between the years 512 and 518. Theodore had consider-

---

[3] Cf. A. PLACANICA, *Da Cartagine a Bisanzio: per la biografia di Vittore Tunnunense*, Vetera Christianorum 26 (1989) 327-336 and idem, *Introduzione*, in: Vittore da Tunnuna, Chronica. Chiesa e impero nell'etá di Giustiniano, a cura di A. Placanica, Firenze 1997, XI-XXXI. Edition and Italian translation: *Vittore da Tunnuna, Chronica. Chiesa e impero nell'età di Giustiniano*, a cura di A. Placanica, Firenze 1997.

[4] Cf. C. MANGO – R. SCOTT, *Introduction*, in: The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor. Byzantine and Near Eastern History AD 284-813, Translated with Introduction and Commentary by C. Mango and R. Scott with the assistance of G. Greatrex, Oxford 1997, LII-C. Edition: *Theophanis Chronographia*, recensuit C. de Boor, vol. I, Lipsiae 1883.

[5] Cf. J. DUFFY – J. PARKER, *Introduction*, in: The Synodicon Vetus, Text, Translation, and Notes by J. Duffy and J. Parker, Washington 1979, XIII-XV. Edition and English translation: *The Synodicon Vetus*, Text, Translation, and Notes by J. Duffy and J. Parker, Washington 1979.

ably drawn on John's work in describing the events from the period of the emperor Zeno's reign. The author had been writing his chronicle as a supporter of Dioscorus and Eutyches, ill-disposed towards Nestorianism and Chalcedonism.[6]

The Roman tradition

An alternative portrayal of Peter the Fuller's career is presented in the work known as *Gesta de nomine Acacii*, which is a summary of how the Christological dispute had developed in the Eastern part of the Empire, with the purpose of explaining the question of the deposition of Acacius by the Roman synod in the year 485. This source, reflecting the Roman point of view, has been preserved as Pope Gelasius' document, although, in all probability, it had been written as early as towards the end of the pontificate of Pope Felix III. In *Gesta*, there are several elements different from Theodore's account; above all, the source omits altogether the role of the emperor Zeno during the times of the first and third episcopates of Peter in Antioch.[7] Certain items of information concerning Peter can also be found in the acts of the Rome synod of October 485 and the papal correspondence, particularly in Pope Gelasius' letter to the bishops of Dardania.[8]

In the mid-6th century a chronicle was written by Liberatus, a Latin Chalcedonian. He was an arch-deacon of Carthage, who had accompanied his bishop Reparatus at Constantinople during the debates connected with the dispute over the Three Chapters, and then at the place of his exile at Euchaita, where most probably the work of Liberatus had been written. His goal was to inform the clergy of the West about the development of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies in the East; in doing so, the author expresses the Roman viewpoint, and is therefore negatively biased towards Peter the Fuller, repeating with some minor modifications the information contained in the *Gesta de nomine Acacii*.[9]

---

[6] Cf. P. Janiszewski, *Jan Diakrinomenos i jego Historia kościelna,* in: Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze, eds. T. Derda – E. Wipszycka, Warszawa 1997, 63-78. The extant fragments published in: *Theodoros Anagnostes, Kirchengeschichte*, herausgegeben von G. Ch. Hansen, Berlin 1971, 152-157.

[7] Cf. O. Günther, *Zu den 'Gesta de nomine Acacii'*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 3 (1894) 146-149 (dates the work to circa 486); E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*, Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische Klasse, n. s. 10.4, München 1934, 265-266 (dates the work to 488); P. Nautin, *L' ecclésiologie romaine à l'époque du schisme d'Acace*, in: École Pratique des Hautes Études, V^{e} section, annuaire 1966-1967, 74 (1966) 139 (dates the work to the beginning of 490). Edition: *Epistulae imperatorum pontificum aliorum inde ab. a. CCCLXVII usque ad a. DLIII datae, Avellana quae dicitur collectio,* recensuit commentario critico instruxit indices adiecit O. Günther, pars. I, Prolegomena. Epistulae I-CIV, Vindobonae 1895 (= CA), no. 99, 440-453.

[8] The acts of the Rome synod in: CA 70, 155-161. *The letter of Pope Gelasius to the bishops of Dardania*: CA 95, 369-398.

[9] Cf. E. Schwartz, *Praefatio,* in: Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum (= ACO), tomus alter, Concilium Universale Chalcedonense, volumen quintum, Collectio

Other sources

Apart from the above-mentioned two main traditions referring to Peter, there are also surviving mentions about him in many other sources. The most important of these is in the *Laudatio sancti Barnabae*, by Alexander, a 6th-century monk living in the Cypriot monastery situated near the church where the tomb of the apostle Barnabas had been located, to the north-west of Salamis. He had written his work between the years 530 and 566, at the order of the curator of that shrine, and read it out in the presence of the metropolitan of Cyprus. The last part of the source deals with the issue of the controversy over Cyprus' independence from the Antiochene patriarchate. As a staunch follower of the island's autocephalia, Alexander presents the figure of Peter the Fuller in a very negative light, as he was believed to act for the re-subordination of Cyprus under Antioch. The information concerning the finding of Barnabas' relics during the dispute with Peter, which had been included in the work, appears to have been used by Victor of Tunnuna.[10]

John Malalas is the Antioch-born author of the *Chronicle* in 18 books, presenting the history since the Creation of the world. We cannot without any doubt determine what the author's religious views were, as in the books devoted to the second half of the 5th century he seems to express some anti-Chalcedonian influence, whereas towards the end of the work (possibly written by a different author) he espouses explicitly Chalcedonian views. Most likely, the part of the *Chronicle* describing the events to AD 526 or 527, had been created while the author was still at Antioch, whereas the part encompassing the reign of Justinian – in Constantinople. John's Antiochene perspective makes it possible for him to present the information on the events in the city during Zeno's reign, which are not known from other sources.[11]

Evagrius Scholasticus, also born in Syria, was the Chalcedonian author of the *Ecclesiastical History* in 6 books, reaching AD 594. For the

---

sangermanensis, edidit E. Schwartz, Berolini – Lipsiae 1936, XVI-XVIII; M. Whitby, *The Church Historians*, 472-477. Published in: ACO II, 5, 98-141.

[10] Cf. P. Van Deun, *Préliminaires*, in: Hagiographica Cypria. Sancti Barnabae Laudatio auctore Alexandro Monacho et Sanctorum Bartholomaei et Barnabae Vita e Menologio imperiali deprompta, editae curante P. Van Deun, Vita Sancti Auxibii, edita curante J. Noret, Turnhout – Leuven 1993, 15-21; B. Kollmann, *Joseph Barnabas. His Life and Legacy*, trans. by M. Henry, Collegeville 2004, 58-59 and B. Kollmann, *Einleitung*, in: Alexander Monachus, Laudatio Barnabae. Lobrede auf Barnabas, eingeleitet von B. Kollmann, übersetzt von B. Kollmann und W. Deuse, Turnhout 2007, 56-60. Edition: *Hagiographica Cypria. Sancti Barnabae Laudatio auctore Alexandro Monacho et Sanctorum Bartholomaei et Barnabae Vita e Menologio imperiali deprompta*, editae curante P. Van Deun, *Vita Sancti Auxibii*, edita curante J. Noret, Turnhout – Leuven 1993.

[11] Cf. *Studies in John Malalas*, ed. by E. Jeffreys with B. Croke and R. Scott, Sydney 1990 and *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas,* t. I, édité par J. Beaucamp, avec la collaboration de S. Agusta-Boularot, A.-M. Bernardi, B. Cabouret, E. Caire, Paris 2004. Edition: *Ioannis Malalae Chronographia*, recensuit I. Thurn, Berlin 2000 (Greek text); V. Istrin, *Chronika Joanna Malaly w slavyanskom perevode*, Pietrograd 1914 (Slavic translation of the books 15-18).

events from the reign of the emperor Zeno Evagrius had considerably drawn on the chronicle by Zacharias Rhetor. Although he had resorted to the archives of the patriarchate of Antioch, the author devoted surprisingly little space to Peter the Fuller and his activity in Syria.[12]

Peter is also mentioned by several sources of anti-Chalcedonian origin. One of the most significant is the *History* by Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor, the only source citing the synodal letter written on the occasion of Peter's re-election to the Antiochene see in 485. The *History* was written in the 490s, however, the source has survived only in the Syrian translation of 569 by an anonymous author, the so-called Pseudo-Zacharias. Zacharias was closely associated with the later Antiochene patriarch Severus, and he had written his history from the anti-Chalcedonian point of view, portraying Peter in a favourable light and presenting a critical view of the Chalcedonian bishops of Antioch.[13]

Some information referring to Peter can also be found in the chronicle by John of Nikiou, in Cyril of Scythopolis' *Vita Sabae*, in treatises and epistles of the foremost opponents of Chalcedon active at the turn of the 5th century, with Philoxenus of Maboug and Severus of Antioch, and also in the *Plerophoria* by John Rufus.[14] Moreover, there is a collection of ten

---

[12] Cf. P. ALLEN, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian*, Louvain 1981, 1-20; M. WHITBY, *Introduction*, in: The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus, translated with an introduction by M. Whitby, Liverpool 2000, XIII-LX; M. WHITBY, *The Church Historians*, 480-492. Edition: *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the scholia*, edited with introduction, critical notes, and indices by J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, London 1898.

[13] Cf. P. ALLEN, *Zachariah Scholasticus and the Historia Ecclesiastica of Evagrius Scholasticus*, Journal of Theological Studies 31 (1980) 471-488; M. WHITBY, *The Church Historians*, 459-466; Ph. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 544-549. The text published in: *Historia Ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, interpretatus est E. W. Brooks, tomus I et II, Lovanii 1924 (CSCO, scriptores Syri, series tertia, tomus V et VI).

[14] The edition and French translation of the *Chronicle* by John of Nikiou: *Chronique de Jean, évêque de Nikiou, texte éthiopien*, ed. par H. Zotenberg, Paris 1883, English translation: *The Chronicle of John, Bishop of Nikiu*, trans. by R. H. Charles, London – Oxford 1916. *Vita Sabae* published in: E. SCHWARTZ, *Kyrillos von Skythopolis*, Leipzig 1939, 85-200. *Philoxenus, The letter to the monks of Tell'Àdda* published in: I. GUIDI, *La lettera di Filosseno ai monaci di Tell'Addâ*, Roma 1884, 449-501. *Severus of Antioch, The letter to Ammonios* published in: *The Sixth Book of Selected Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch*, vol. II, edited and translation by E. W. Brooks, Oxford 1903, 253-257; Severus of Antioch's Homily 125 on the *Trishagion* published in: *Les ,Homiliae cathedrales' de Sévère d'Antioche. Traduction syriaque de Jacques d'Édesse. Homélies CXX à CXXV*, éditées et traduites par M. Brière, Paris 1960 (Patrologia Orientalis (= PO) 29); The *Plerophoria* by John Rufus published in: *Jean Rufus, Plérophories. Témoignages et révélations contre le Concile de Chalcédoine*, version syriaque et traduction française éditées par F. Nau, Paris 1911 (PO 8). Other sources: *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts = A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts. Cambridge University Library Ms. Oriental 1319*, Edited and Translated by L. Abramowski and A. E. Goodman, volume II, Introduction, Translation, Indexes, Cambridge 1972; *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan = Kitab Al-'Unvan. Histoire universelle écrite par Agapius (Mahboub) de Menbidj*, éditée et traduite en français par A. Vasiliev, (seconde partie (II)), Paris 1912, 139-175 (PO 8); *Cedrenus, Compendium Historiarum* = Georgius Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*,

letters addressed to Peter the Fuller by Pope Felix, archbishop of Constantinople Acacius and other bishops, pertaining to the question of the *Trishagion*. This correspondence is, however, not authentic; it was created by pro-Chalcedonian monks from the monastery of the Sleepless Monks, near Constantinople.[15]

The supposed authorship of Pseudo-Dionysius' letters

In a series of articles written in the 1960s and 1970s Rudolf RIEDINGER expressed his support for the view held by the Dominican monk Michel LEQUIEN at the beginning of the 18th century, who claimed that the author of the Pseudo-Dionysius' letters was Peter the Fuller.[16] RIEDINGER had

---

ab I. Bekkero suppletus et emendatus, tomus prior, Bonnae 1838; *Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens = Chronica minora*, interpretatus est I. Guidi, E. W. Brooks, J.-B. Chabot, Parisiis – Lipsiae 1903 (CSCO, Scriptores Syri, series tertia, t. IV), 121-169; *Chronicon Iacobi Edesseni = Chronica minora*, interpretatus est I. Guidi, E. W. Brooks, J.-B. Chabot, Parisiis – Lipsiae 1903 (CSCO, Scriptores Syri, series tertia, t. IV), 197-241; *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum = Incerti auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum*, interpretatus est J.-B. Chabot, tomus I, Lovanii 1949 (CSCO, Scriptores Syri, series tertia, t. I); *Codex Iustinianus = Corpus Iuris Civilis*, editio stereotypa octava, volumen secundum, *Codex Iustinianus*, recognovit P. Krueger, Berolini 1906; *Damascius, Vita Isidori = Photius, Bibliothèque*, texte établi et traduit par R. Henry, tome VI, "*Codices" 242-245*, Paris 1971, 8-56; *Facundus of Hermiane, Pro defensione trium capitulorum = Facundi episcopi ecclesiae Hermianensis opera omnia*, edidit J.-M. Clément et R. Vander Plaetse, Turnholti 1974; *John of Damascus, Expositio Fidei = Die Schriften des Johannes von Damascus*, Band II, *Expositio Fidei*, ed. B. Kotter, Berlin 1973, (= Patristische Texte und Studien 12); *John of Antioch = Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*, introduzione, edizione critica e traduzione a cura di U. Roberto, Berlin 2005 (= Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Band 154); *Joshua Stylites = The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite*, translated with notes and introduction by F. R. Trombley and J. W. Watt, Liverpool 2000; *Michael the Syrian = Chronique de Michel le Syrien: Patriarche Jacobite d'Antioche (1166-1198)*, éditee pour le premiére fois et traduite en français par J.-B. Chabot, tome II (livre VIII-XI), Paris 1901; *Nikephorus Kallistus = Nicefor Kallistos Xanthopoulos, Ecclesiastica Historia*, in: Patrologia Graeca, tome 147; *Pseudo-Dionysius, De divinis nominibus = Corpus Dionysiacum*, vol. 1, *De Divinibus Nominibus*, ed. B. R. Suchla, Berlin – New York 1990 (= Patristische Texte und Studien 33); *Pseudo-Dionysius, De ecclesiastica hierarchia = Corpus Dionysiacum*, vol. 2, *De Coelesti Hierarchia, De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, De Mystica Theologia, Epistulae*, ed. G. Heil – A. M. Ritter, Berlin – New York 1991, 63-132 (= Patristische Texte und Studien 36); *Pseudo-Dionysius, Ep. = Corpus Dionysiacum*, vol. 2, *De Coelesti Hierarchia, De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, De Mystica Theologia, Epistulae*, ed. G. Heil – A. M. Ritter, Berlin – New York 1991, 155-210 (= Patristische Texte und Studien 36).

[15] Cf. the introduction by Eduard Schwartz in: ACO III, pp. XI-XIII; E. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 287-300 and A. GRILLMEIER with T. HAINTHALER, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. II, part II, The Church of Constantinople in the Fifth Century, translated by P. Allen, J. Cawte, London 1995, 253. Edition: ACO III, 6-25 and 217-231. The objective of the Sleepless Monks was to create a body of fictitious documents that were meant to aid them in their struggle against the addition to the *Trishagion*, by Peter the Fuller.

[16] Cf. a number of articles by Utto (= Rudolf) Riedinger: cf. U. RIEDINGER, *Pseudo-Dyonisios Areopagites, Pseudo-Kaisarios und die Akoimeten*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 52 (1959) 276-296; idem, *Petros der Walker von Antiochia als Verfasser der pseudo-*

drawn attention, first of all, to the similarities of the liturgical innovations, which are attributed to Peter, to the relevant passages in the letters of Pseudo-Dionysius. As a matter of fact, public consecration of myron, epiclesis over the baptismal water, and recitation of the Creed during the Eucharist, are mentioned in the *Church Hierarchy*.[17] In turn, the invocation to the Virgin Mary *Theotokos* is described by Pseudo-Dionysius in the work *On the Names of God*.[18] Furthermore, one can find in Pseudo-Dionysius' letters an accolade of the apostle Peter,[19] which, in RIEDINGER's opinion, was meant to strengthen his claims to the Antiochene see, whilst his justification of the disputes with the Greeks[20] was to serve as a reply to the accusations levelled by the neo-Platonists of Athens, about a certain bishop named Peter as a corrupt and shameless man.[21] The author also connects the phenomenon of the solar eclipse from Pseudo-Dionysius' correspondence[22] with the eclipse that had reportedly occurred on 14 January 484, which is linked to the death of Proclus. From *De malorum subsistentia* by Proclus, Pseudo-Dionysius had also borrowed his conception of evil,[23] which was an argument for RIEDINGER to support the thesis that prior to his joining the monastery Peter the Fuller had been one of Proclus' disciples. According to RIEDINGER, Peter had written the works in question under the name of Dionysius Areopagite at the time of his exile, first at the monastery of the Sleepless Monks, then at Euchaita. The whole thesis described above, as attractive as it may be, cannot be directly verified in the light of the sources available, and has been questioned by the scholars as improbable.[24]

dionysischen Schriften, Salzburger Jahrbuch für Philosophie 5/6 (1961-1962) 135-156; idem, *Der Verfasser der pseudo-dionysischen Schriften*, Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 54 (1964) 146-152 and idem, *Akoimeten*, in: Theologische Realenzyklopädie, vol. II, Berlin – New York 1978, 149-151.

[17] *Pseudo-Dionysius, De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 4, 2 (consecration of myron); ibidem, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 2,7 (epiclesis over the baptismal water); ibidem, *De ecclesiastica hierarchia* 3,2 and 3,3,7 (recitation of the symbol of faith at the Eucharist).

[18] *Pseudo-Dionysius, De divinis nominibus* 3,2. On the liturgical innovations attributed to Peter, see below.

[19] *Pseudo-Dionysius, Ep.* 10 to John on the island of Patmos.

[20] *Pseudo-Dionysius, Ep.* 7 to Policarpus.

[21] *Damascius, Vita Isidori* 170, 39.

[22] *Pseudo-Dionysius, Ep.* 7 to Policarpus.

[23] *Pseudo-Dionysius, De divinis nominibus* 4,19-35.

[24] Cf. J.-M. HORNUS, *Les recherches dionysiennes de 1955 a 1960*, Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 41 (1961) 56-64; L. PERRONE, *Pietro il Fullone*, in: Dizionario patristico e di antichita cristiana 2 (1983) col. 2794-2795; A. SOLIGNAC, *Pierre le Foulon*, in: Dictionnaire de Spiritualité 12, 2 (1986) col. 1588-1590; P. ROREM – J. C. LAMOREAUX, *John of Scythopolis and the Dionysian Corpus. Annotating the Areopagite*, Oxford 1998, 9-10 and K.-H. UTHEMANN, *Petros der Walker*, in: Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche 8 (1999) col. 143.

Peter the Fuller's background and early years

We do not have much information on the life of Peter the Fuller before his coming to Antioch at the turn of the 460s and 470s.[25] We do not know where he had come from, when he was born, or who his parents were. The later account in the *Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens* attempts to explain the origin of his cognomen by mentioning that his parents had been fullers by profession.[26] However, the *Laudatio* in honour of St Barnabas and a collection of Nestorian Christological texts link the cognomen with the profession performed by Peter himself.[27]

According to the information contained in the *Gesta de nomine Acacii* and in the work of Liberatus, Peter had been in charge of one of the monasteries at Constantinople, which he however had to leave due to some more precisely unidentified "crimes" (*crimina*) and then went to Antioch.[28] Alexander the Monk in the *Laudatio* in honour of the apostle Barnabas and the anonymous author of the *Synodicon Vetus* state this information more precisely, mentioning that Peter the Fuller was a monk at the monastery of the Sleepless Monks.[29] On the other hand, Theodore Lector mentions that he had been a presbyter at the church of the martyr Bassa at Chalcedon, from where he had come to Antioch with Zeno.[30] John Malalas also associates him with the church at Chalcedon, but according to his account, Peter was not a presbyter but a *paramonarios* of St Euphemia's church there.[31] Agapius, in his chronicle, mentions that Peter was the head of the monastery at Chalcedon.[32]

Both the Roman tradition and Theodore Lector's account draw, as a matter of fact, on the Constantinopolitan sources, and their items of

---

[25] Cf. L. PERRONE, *Pietro il Fullone*, col. 2794.

[26] Cf. *Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens*, 165.

[27] Cf. *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 108 and *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, 19.

[28] Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450 and *Liberatus* 17, 122.

[29] *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 108; likewise, *Synodicon Vetus* 98. On the monastery of the Akoimetoi, see J. PARGOIRE, *Un mot sur les acémètes*, Échos d'Orient 2 (1898-1899) 304-308, 365-372; idem, *Rufinianes*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 8 (1899) 429-477; V. GRUMEL, *Acémètes*, in: Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, vol. I, Paris 1937, col. 169-175; R. RIEDINGER, *Akoimeten*, 148-153.

[30] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 390 and *Theophanes* AM 5956. On the church of St Bassa, see J. PARGOIRE, *Sainte-Bassa de Chalcédoine*, Échos d'Orient 6 (1903) 315-317 and R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin, première partie: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, vol. *II, Les églises et les monastères des grands centres byzantins (Bithynie, Hellespont, Latros, Galèsios, Trébizonde, Athènes, Thessalonique)*, Paris 1975, 33-34.

[31] *John Malalas* XV, 1. On the church of St Euphemia, see R. JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, 31-33. Eduard Schwartz links both of these items of information, saying in general that Peter was a presbyter and paramonarios of the church at Chalcedon, and at the same time archimandrite of a certain monastery, cf. E. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 182.

[32] Cf. *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan*, 420. Cf. also *A Nestorian Collection of Christological Texts*, 19, where there is general information that Peter had been the head of some monastery.

information supplement each other, aside from the information on the Sleepless Monks. The Roman tradition, in its description of Peter, is based directly on Acacius' letter from Constantinople, written in 477, to pope Simplicius,[33] and therefore a few years only after Peter's first tumultuous attempt at acceding to the Antiochene see. The account as stated by the Roman tradition should therefore be more credible than Theodore's or Alexander the Monk's versions. The modern scholars, however, link the above-mentioned accounts of Theodore and the Roman tradition with the information from the *Laudatio*, assuming that after Peter had been removed from the monastery of the Sleepless Monks for the views he had held, he became a presbyter at the church of the martyr Bassa at Chalcedon.[34] If, however, Peter had been in charge of one of the Constantinopolitan monasteries, it could not have been the monastery of the Sleepless Monks, as the head of the monastery at that time was Marcellus the Akoimetos.[35] Besides, it is difficult to reconcile the account of the *Laudatio*, which mentions the monastery of the Sleepless Monks located, at that time, at Irenaion, north of Chalcedon, with the Roman tradition directly mentioning a monastery in Constantinople. Probably, Alexander the Monk had combined the information about Peter's stay at the Sleepless Ones' monastery between the years 471 and 475, and his earlier life.[36] As it is confirmed that in 536 there had existed a monastery at the church of St Bassa at Chalcedon, it is possible that it had already functioned several decades earlier and that Peter had been the man in charge of it, for which however there is no direct evidence, except for a vague mention in Agapius. One way or the other, at the end of the 460s Peter the Fuller had committed some unidentified crimes, in the result of which he was expelled from the monastery. The *Gesta* do not specify whether they concerned some dogmatic issues, or if Peter was formally condemned, albeit it may be

[33] Cf. E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 162 (document 19). Acacius' letter has survived only as a summary in *Gesta*. Pope Simplicius' reply of 9 October 477 in: E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 121-122. At the time of writing his letter Acacius had not yet known about the death of Timothy Ailuros on 31 July 477, hence it had probably taken place in the first half of that year, cf. V. Grumel, *Les regestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol. I, *Les actes des patriarches*, fasc. I, *Les regestes de 381 à 715*, Paris 1932, 66 (no. 151).

[34] Cf. G. Fritz, *Pierre le Foulon*, in: Dictionnaire de théologie catholique 12 (1935) col. 1933; H. Bacht, *Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums in den kirchenpolitischen Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (431-519)*, in: Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart, herausgegeben von A. Grillmeier, H. Bacht, Band II, Entscheidung um Chalkedon, Würzburg 1953, 260; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 169-170.

[35] On Marcellus Akoimetos, see R. Kosiński, ΑΓΙΩΣΥΝΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ. *Konstantynopolitańscy święci mężowie i władza w V wieku po Chr.*, Warszawa 2006, 203-207.

[36] Cf. A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, Band 2.3, *Die Kirchen von Jerusalem und Antiochien nach 451-600*, Freiburg 2004, 302, who have noticed the paradox of Peter's relations with the Sleepless Monks, staunch supporters of the Council of Chalcedon.

assumed that the author would not have failed to mention the fact of such a condemnation.[37]

A different view of Peter's background has been proposed by Rudolf RIEDINGER, who, as already mentioned above, had identified the author of the Pseudo-Dionysius' writings with Peter and put forward the hypothesis that prior to his conversion to Christianity he had been a member of Proclus' philosophical group in Athens, whose adherents had been following certain ascetic practices. Around the year 465, Peter had met the Sleepless Monks, had been baptized and entered their monastery to become a monk and later on a deacon. The cognomen "fuller" that he had received, should be, in RIEDINGER's opinion, interpreted symbolically. It was apparently to refer to Peter's task of teaching catechumens with which he had been entrusted. This hypothesis of Peter the Fuller's early years, as well as the entire hypothesis proposed by RIEDINGER, have been repudiated by historiography.[38]

The first episcopate

Towards the end of the 460s Peter had arrived at Antioch. The detailed account of that event was presented by Theodore Lector, who mentioned that after Zeno's appointment as *magister militum per Orientem*, Peter joined his retinue and proceeded with him to Antioch.[39] The Roman tradition only mentions Peter's escape to Antioch after he had committed a crime, and does not link this fact chronologically in any way to Zeno's appointment as commander-in-chief in the East.[40]

In accordance with Theodore's chronology, Peter's coming to Antioch may have taken place no sooner than at the end of 469, when Zeno had headed east,[41] whereas the subsequent turbulent events, which were connected with Peter the Fuller's stay in the city, could not have hap-

[37] Cf. G. FRITZ, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1933; H. BACHT, *Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums*, 260; L. PERRONE, *Pietro il Fullone*, col. 2794; A. GRILLMEIER – T. HAINTHALER, *Jesus der Christus*, 297-298 and Ph. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 170. Incidentally, we know the name of one of Peter's disciples and fellow monks from his monastery years. It was Peter the Isaurian, bishop of Titiopolis, who had been sent by Peter the Fuller, after his return to the bishop's throne in 485, to John Rufus to persuade him to return to Antioch, cf. *John Rufus, Plerophoriae* 22, 47-48. Unfortunately, the author, describing Peter the Isaurian as a *synkellos* (σύγκελλος) of Peter the Fuller, does not say precisely whether it concerned the period before 469, or during the time following the first deposition of the Antiochene bishop, which he had spent at the monastery of the Sleepless Monks at Irenaion.

[38] Cf. notes 16 and 24 above.

[39] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 390; *Theophanes* AM 5956; likewise, *Synodicon Vetus* 98.

[40] Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 95, 450: *Antiochiam fugisse*; *Liberatus* 17, 122: *Antiochiam refugisse*.

[41] Cf. R. KOSIŃSKI, *Początek kariery Tarasikodissy-Zenona*, in: Byzantina Europaea. Księga jubileuszowa ofiarowana profesorowi Waldemarowi Ceranowi, eds. M. Kokoszko – M. J. Leszka, Łódź 2007, 300.

pened later than early spring 471, when the emperor Leo issued the law forbidding the Antiochene monks to engage in theological matters. It was, most probably, the emperor's response to the turmoil that Peter had caused in the church there.[42]

After his coming to the city on the Orontes Peter won over the support of a group of people considered by Theodore Lector and Theophanes as followers of Apollinarius.[43] That label was probably to indicate the local Eutychians, and therefore anti-Chalcedonians.[44] Monks must have enjoyed some considerable influence among the members of that group, which is implied by the content of the imperial law. Was Peter, therefore, an active anti-Chalcedonian at that time? Even though Lorenzo PERRONE calls him the first Monophysite patriarch of Antioch,[45] Aloys GRILLMEIER is right to notice that for the period of his first episcopate we do not find any mentions suggesting Peter's hostile attitude towards the Council of Chalcedon. We only know of Peter's anathema against those who do not believe in "crucified God", which indicates his hostility towards Nestorianism.[46] Theodore Lector and Alexander the Monk, on the other hand, draw attention to his associations with Apollinarianism,[47] while the later leaders of the anti-Chalcedonian movement, in particular Severus of Antioch will treat Peter with great distrust.[48]

The turmoil incited by Peter's followers had led to the bishop Martyrius' departure from Antioch,[49] and his coming to Constantinople

---

[42] See *Codex Iustinianus*, I, 3, 29. Eduard Schwartz concluded that the beginning of the pontificate of Peter's successor, Julian, could not have taken place later than in 470, cf. E. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 182, note 3. The idea that there is a connection between the Antiochene events inspired by Peter the Fuller and the instituted law has also been expressed by P. T. R. GRAY, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*, Leiden 1979, 23.

[43] *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 390, and *Theophanes* AM 5956. Likewise, *Synodicon Vetus* 98.

[44] Also E. SCHWARTZ, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 182. Cf. R. DEVREESSE, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe*, Paris 1945, 65; G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton – New Jersey 1961, 485 and A. GRILLMEIER – T. HAINTHALER, *Jesus der Christus*, 298. G. Fritz and William Frend accept the literal meaning of Theodore's words, believing that Peter received support from the adherents of Apollinarius' views, who were still numerous at Antioch, cf. G. FRITZ, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1934 and W. H. C. FREND, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Century*, Oxford 1972, 167.

[45] Lorenzo Perrone describes him as "primo patriarca monofisita di Antiochia", cf. L. PERRONE, *Pietro il Fullone*, col. 2794, and Cornelia Horn "the first anti-chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch", cf. C. B. HORN, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine. The Career of Peter the Iberian*, Oxford 2006, 42.

[46] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 390 and *Theophanes* AM 5956.

[47] Cf. *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 110, with the information that by including the addition to the *Trishagion*, Peter had tried to gain favour with the followers of Apollinarius.

[48] Cf. A. GRILLMEIER – T. HAINTHALER, *Jesus der Christus*, 301-302.

[49] On Martyrios, see S. J. VOICU, *Martiri di Antiochia*, in: Dizionario patristico e di antichita cristiana 2 (1983) col. 2154.

in the hopes of finding some support there. Seizing the opportunity, Peter replaced Martyrius and was consecrated as bishop of Antioch[50]. Alexander the Monk writes that at first Peter had attempted to defame Martyrius before the emperor and others, accusing him of Nestorianism.[51] The information in the *Laudatio* is confirmed by the anti-Chalcedonian tradition;[52] John Rufus in his *Plerophoriae* states in explicit terms that Martyrius had been banished for "flagrant heresy".[53] Therefore, the turmoil caused by Peter had probably led to Martyrius' escape from the city, and his turning to Constantinople not only to seek support there but also to justify and clear himself of the allegations of being a supporter of Nestorianism.[54]

In Constantinople, Martyrius had been cleared of the accusations and gained strong support of the patriarch Gennadius, and thanks to him the emperor Leo I had ordered that Martyrius should be restored to the see of Antioch and Peter the Fuller deposed and sent into exile at the Oasis in Upper Egypt.[55] In order to quell the opposition against Martyrius, the emperor had also issued, on 1 June 471, the law addressed at Zeno, which prohibited the monks from leaving their monasteries and staying at Antioch, getting involved in theological issues and inciting any disturbances.[56]

These events raise the question of Zeno's role in the ousting of Martyrius. Theodore Lector, ill-disposed towards the future emperor, writes that he had been Peter's protector, aided him in removing Martyrius and taking over the see of Antioch. John Diacrinomenos states that Zeno had gone as far as to pressure the bishops assembled for the synod at Seleucia so that they elect and consecrate Peter as bishop.[57] That

---

[50] *Theodore Lector, Epitome,* 392; *Theophanes,* AM 5956; *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan*, 420, writes that Peter had deceived the Antiochenes with the false information that his election is in accord with the emperor Leo's will. On the other hand, Alexander the Monk stresses that the inhabitants of Antioch themselves, at least the local Apollinarians, had asked for Peter's appointment, cf. *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 109.

[51] *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 109.

[52] *Pseudo-Zacharias,* IV, 11; *John Rufus, Plerophoriae,* 89, 145, 147. Cf. A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 294.

[53] *John Rufus, Plerophoriae,* 89, 144: *hérésie évidente*. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 486 believes that Martyrius had left Antioch at his own will and gone to Constantinople alarmed at the increasing opposition inspired by Peter.

[54] Cf. G. Fritz, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1934.

[55] Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii,* 25, CA 99, 450; *Liberatus* 17, 122; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 392, *Theophanes* AM 5956 and *Synodicon Vetus* 98. Cf. also *Laudatio S. Barnabae,* 109.

[56] *Codex Iustinianus*, 1, I, 3, 29. Cf. also an analysis in: A. S. Scarcella, *La legislazione di Leone I,* Milano 1997, 276-282.

[57] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 390; *Theophanes* AM 5956; *John Diacrinomenos, Epitome* 540. The scholars generally give credence to Theodore's tradition and assume that Zeno had been Peter's patron, actively supporting him in his attempts to take over the Antiochene see, cf. for instance E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 182; G. Fritz, *Pierre le Foulon,* col. 1934; R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche*, 65;

synod had convened probably with the purpose of passing a judgement over Martyrius' alleged pro-Nestorian sympathies. These accounts point out to Zeno's active role in the events. However, the Roman tradition, both the *Gesta de nomine Acacii* and Liberatus, does not inform, at all, of any Zeno's involvement in favour of Peter the Fuller. This lack of information on the part of the Roman tradition can be yet explained by the fact that in the accounts referring to the years 470-471, it draws on the letter of patriarch Acacius to Simplicius of 477. Certainly, Acacius did not have any reasons for underscoring the role of the ruling emperor in elevating to the Antiochene see a man regarded as a heretic.

Nevertheless, a different scenario of what had really happened seems more likely. After he had arrived at Antioch, Zeno encountered the turmoil and the accusations levelled at Martyrius of his alleged preaching of Nestorian heresy.[58] In order to resolve the tense situation, he had taken steps to call a synod to be held at Seleucia, where Martyrius was condemned and his successor, Peter the Fuller, consecrated. Zeno, in conformity with the synod's decision, had made it possible for him to take over duties at Antioch, especially as, in all probability, Peter had garnered a great deal of support among the inhabitants of the city.[59] Those events had probably taken place at the end of 470 or the beginning of 471, as Martyrius' intervention in Constantinople may be dated to early spring 471. At the capital, Martyrius had appealed to Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, who cleared him, possibly at the *endemousa* synod,[60] of the accusation of heresy. The bishop had gained the ground for returning to the throne at Antioch,[61] while Gennadius had moreover obtained a legal sanction directed at Zeno on June 1, 471 and

---

G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 486; W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 167; A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 298; K.-H. Uthemann, *Petros der Walker*, col. 143; Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 169-171; P. Norton, *Episcopal Elections 250-600. Hierarchy and Popular Will in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2007, 93.

[58] *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 109 mentions that Peter informed Zeno of the threat of escalating unrest if Martyrius were not to be deposed. Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 171, note 376 believes that summoning the synod at Seleucia by Zeno proves that Peter had the will to act in strict adherence to the canons.

[59] Cf. *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 109.

[60] The *Gesta* and Liberatus remind of the fact that Peter the Fuller had been banished from Antioch on the grounds of the sentence issued by the bishops. It may indicate an *endemousa* synod or a synod of bishops of the East. Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450 and *Liberatus* 17, 122. The verdict concerning Peter is also mentioned by Alexander the Monk; he states that the basis for passing the verdict was Peter's position against the Orthodox faith, and first of all his introduction of the Theopaschite addition to the *Trishagion*, cf. *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 110. The author of the *Laudatio*, however, seems to blend into one the events from the two episcopates of Peter, and therefore the verdict in question may in fact refer to the situation from the year 476. Cf. A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 299.

[61] G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 487 is of the opinion that the imperial verdict had been supported with the decision of the Antiochene synod.

aimed against Martyrius' opponents and Peter the Fuller himself, who was to be banished to the Oasis in Egypt. It was probably Zeno who had to enforce both decisions of Leo I.[62]

Little is known about Peter's activity during the first period of his tenure at Antioch. Theodore Lector, followed by Theophanes, say that it was then that he had introduced a Theopaschite – in their opinion – addition to the *Trishagion.* Peter the Fuller had added to the known version of the hymn: "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal", the words "who was crucified for us".[63] The author of the *Synodicon Vetus*, representing the same tradition, writes that Peter had introduced the addition formally at the Antiochene synod.[64]

The deposition of Peter, which amounted in fact to as much as the restoration of Martyrius, had led to a new wave of turmoil at Antioch, which forced the bishop, accused of pro-Nestorian sympathies, into resignation. We do not know practically anything about his successor, Julian. He must have been a man much less controversial than his predecessors, as we do not hear of any disturbances in the aftermath of his election.[65]

As we have already mentioned, Peter was allegedly banished to the Great Oasis in Egypt, the traditional place of exile for bishops.[66] However, the *Synodicon Vetus* says that Peter the Fuller had managed to escape and find a refuge at the monastery of the Sleepless Monks near Constantinople.[67] On the other hand, the *Gesta*, followed by Liberatus, state that Peter had fled from the exile and appeared at the capital, where he subsequently had pledged that he would not ever cause any disturbance.[68]

---

[62] Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 171, note 376 believes that Peter became bishop only after Martyrius had finally resigned in the middle of 471, yet he offers no convincing arguments to support it. The law of 1 June of that year issued by the emperor Leo, can be no doubt linked with Peter's final banishment, which must have taken place in late spring, and not as suggested by Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 171, note 377, only several months later. On the other hand, G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 486-487 believes that Peter had been bishop of Antioch twice in that period: first, when he took over the see during Martyrius' absence, and then again after his resignation. There is no evidence to support this hypothesis, either.

[63] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 390, and *Theophanes* AM 5956. On the hymn and Peter's addition thereto, see below.

[64] Cf. *Synodicon Vetus* 98. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 485 doubts whether Peter had really summoned a synod in order to accept the new version of the *Trishagion.*

[65] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 392 and *Theophanes* AM 5956. Cf. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 487 and A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 299.

[66] Cf. I. Milewski, *Depozycje i zsyłki biskupów w Cesarstwie Wschodniorzymskich (lata 325-451)*, Gdańsk 2008, 357-366.

[67] Cf. *Synodicon Vetus* 98. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 392 and *Theophanes* AM 5956 mention generally that Peter had evaded the exile thanks to his flight, even though *Theophanes* AM 5967 also says that until Basiliscus' usurpation, he had stayed hidden at the monastery of the Sleepless Monks.

Most probably, therefore, the sentence of exile at the Oasis had been repealed by the emperor on the condition that Peter would withdraw from public activity and lead a reclusive life at the monastery.[69] Perhaps the change had been the result of the influence exerted by Zeno, who had reportedly returned to Constantinople in the second half of 471. I believe it would be erroneous, however, to overestimate the relations between those two figures, especially as after his accession to the throne, Zeno did not restore Peter as bishop.

The second episcopate

The turning point of Peter the Fuller's career came with the usurpation of Basiliscus at the beginning of 475.[70] With his exile punishment revoked, Timothy Ailuros, patriarch of Alexandria, decided to strengthen the position of the anti-Chalcedonians in the Empire, after he had arrived at Constantinople. Therefore, he had brought about the restorations to the episcopal sees at Ephesus and Antioch of, respectively, Paul and Peter the Fuller, who were accused of heresy and deposed in the reign of Leo I.[71] Peter had accepted the anti-Chalcedonian *Encyclical* of Basiliscus and, taking advantage of the bishop Julian's death, acceded to the see of Antioch, not without, as it seems, causing some turmoil in the city as a consequence.[72] Those developments had probably taken place in the same period as Timothy's summoning of the synod at Ephesus, in the summer of 475.[73]

---

[68] Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450: *Constantinopolim redisse*; *Liberatus* 17, 122: *fugiens redisse Constantinopolim.* These sources do not mention the monastery of the Sleepless Monks.

[69] Cf. G. FRITZ, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1934.

[70] On Basiliscus, see first of all M. SALAMON, *Basiliscus cum Romanis suis*, in: Studia Moesiaca, eds. L. Mrozewicz – K. Ilski, Poznań 1994, 179-196, and also G. M. BERSANETTI, *Basilisco e l'Imperatore Leone I*, Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 20 (1943-1944) 331-346; E. STEIN, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. I, *De l'État romain à l'État byzantin (284-476)*, Paris – Bruxelles – Amsterdam 1959, 361-364; M. REDIES, *Die Usurpation des Basiliskos (475-476) im Kontext der Aufsteigenden monophysitischen Kirche*, Antiquite Tardive 5 (1997) 211-221; J. PROSTKO-PROSTYŃSKI, *Basiliskos: Ein in Rom anerkannter Usurpator,* Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 133 (2000) 259-265.

[71] *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 2 and V, 5; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 402-405; *Theophanes* AM 5967; *Evagrius* III, 5; *Victor of Tunnuna,* s.a. 477.3 (the author does not mention Peter's first episcopate at all); *John Malalas* XV, 1 and XV, 5 (he states incorrectly that Zeno himself had put him up for the Antiochene see); *Liberatus* 17, 122.

[72] *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 410; *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 3; *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan*, 421. Cf. G. FRITZ, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1934 and Ph. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 184. The *Encyclical* was issued on 6 April 475, cf. Ph. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 173. The text in: E. SCHWARTZ, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos,* Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse. XXXII, 6, Münich 1927, 49-51 (document no. 73, long review); *Evagrius* III, 4 (short review); *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 2 (short review); *Nikephorus Kallistus* XVI, 3 (the text follows Evagrius' version).

[73] Cf. *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 3-5; *Evagrius* III, 5-6; *Nikephorus Kallistus* XVI, 5, col. 128; *Liberatus* IX, 5. M. REDIES, *Die Usurpation des Basiliskos*, 214 dates that synod to

We do not know if Peter had undertaken any decisive steps against Chalcedonians after returning to the see of Antioch.[74] Although Theodore mentions serious disturbances involving bloodshed, he states that the reason was Peter's addition to the *Trishagion*, not the questions connected with the Council of Chalcedon.[75] Peter consecrated John Codonatus as bishop of Apamea, but the latter was not accepted by the inhabitants of that city.[76] We are not quite certain of John's Christological beliefs.[77] Another person of whom we know that had been consecrated by Peter, as priest, was John Rufus, known for his ardent and staunch hostility towards the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon.[78]

In August of 476 Zeno returned to the imperial throne, whereas Basiliscus and his family died at the place of exile some time later.[79] The emperor, supported by the patriarch of Constantinople Acacius, had quite promptly cancelled the usurper's personal decisions, removing from office, among others, Peter the Fuller and ordering to send him to Pityus on the Black Sea.[80] Finally, the place of his exile was the shrine of St Theodore Tiron at Euchaita.[81] The reason for his banishment was, above

---

October 475 at the latest, while Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 180 back to September. Cf. also S. Lenain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, tome XVI, Paris 1712, 299-300, Ch. J. Hefele – H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, Paris 1908, vol. II, 912-913, W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 171-172.

[74] Cf. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 488, who is of the opinion that Peter had actively opposed the Chalcedonians.

[75] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 410. Likewise *Theophanes* AM 5967.

[76] *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450; *Liberatus* 17, 122-123. Theodore Lector and Theophanes place John's consecration during Peter's first episcopate, cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 392 and *Theophanes* AM 5956. Cf. also A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 299-300.

[77] Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450, with the information that in 476 it was John who had banished Peter from Antioch ([Iohannes] *Petrum episcopatus sui pellit auctorem et inuadit eius ecclesiam*). Cf. *Liberatus* 17, 123. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 489 believes however that John was a Monophysite.

[78] Cf. *John Rufus, Plerophoriae* 22, 47. See also B. Bitton-Ashkelony – A. Kofsky, *Christian Gaza in Late Antiquity*, Leiden – Boston 2004, 91 and C. B. Horn, *Asceticism and Christological Controversy*, 42. On John Rufus and the works attributed to his authorship more in: J.-E. Steppa, *John Rufus and the World Vision of Anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, Piscataway 2002, 57-80.

[79] On the subject of various accounts concerning the circumstances of the death of Basiliscus and his family, see K. Twardowska, *Cesarzowe bizantyjskie 2 poł. V w. Kobiety a władza*, Kraków 2006, 176-182.

[80] On Pityus as a place of exile, see E. Diehl, *Pityus*, in: Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Band 20/2, Stuttgart 1950, cols. 1883-1884 and I. Milewski, *Depozycje i zsyłki biskupów*, 364, note 538.

[81] Cf. *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 5; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 415; *Theophanes* AM 5969; *Evagrius* III, 8; *John Malalas* XV, 6 only writes that the emperor Zeno had sent Peter into exile at Euchaita, not mentioning any other possible place of exile. Likewise, *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan*, 421 and *John of Nikiou* 88, 43. Cf. G. Fritz, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1934; A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 300 and Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 190. According to Michel van Esbroeck, in

all, the close political relations with Basiliscus,[82] but the legal basis for the deposition was the verdict passed by the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan synods, which had again recognized Peter as a heretic.[83] The *Synodicon Vetus* mentions that also at Cyrus, towards the end of Basiliscus' reign, the local bishop John had summoned a synod that issued an anathema against Peter the Fuller.[84]

After a three-month long episcopate of John Codonatus,[85] Stephen, who was a Chalcedonian, became the new bishop of Antioch, while Acacius, who wanted to have a safeguard against Peter's possible appeal to Rome, wrote in 477 a letter to Pope Simplicius, in which he described Peter the Fuller's heretical activity and asked the pope to never give his consent to justify him.[86] The letter to Simplicius is an indication, therefore, of the fact that Peter had still, despite his exile, continued to pose a certain threat. The proof may be also the developments in connection with the Antiochene bishop Stephen, who was, like Martyrius before, accused of Nestorianism by the followers of Peter the Fuller, according to Theophanes. Although Stephen was later cleared of the charges by the

---

Theodore Lector's passage the information refers not to the monastery of Theodore at Euchaita, but to Peter's finding of a refuge at the tomb of Theodore of Euchaita at Amasea, cf. M. van Esbroeck, *The Memra on the Parrot*, 468. The scholar is, however, mistaken – Peter did not seek refuge at Amasea proper, but at Theodore Tiron's shrine at Euchaita, located west of Amasea, cf. Ch. Walter, *The Warrior Saints in Byzantine Art and Tradition*, Aldershot 2003, 44-66, especially 56-58. Concerning the location of Euchaita, see H. Grégoire, *Géographie byzantine*, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 19 (1913) 59-61 and C. Foss, *Euchaita*, in: The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, ed. A. P. Kazhdan, New York – Oxford 1991, 737.

[82] The political reasons for Peter the Fuller's deposition are stressed by: *John Malalas* XV, 5; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 415; *Theophanes* AM 5969; *John of Nikiou* 88, 43; *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, 171.

[83] Cf. *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450-451; *Theophanes* AM 5969; *Synodicon Vetus* 101 and *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 110-111. Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 190 is of the opinion, however, that the deposition and exile of Peter had been based only on the imperial legal sanction.

[84] Cf. *Synodicon Vetus* 100. The exile had taken place at the turn of 476. *Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens*, 166 mentions that Peter's second episcopate was two years long.

[85] Cf. *Theodore Lector*, *Epitome* 415 and *Theophanes* AM 5969. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 489 believes that the ground for deposing John from the Antiochene see was his theological views. Cf. also A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 300 and Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 190-191. In 483 John Codonatus, supported by Acacius, became bishop of Tyre (*Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 451; *Liberatus* 17, 123). According to Philippe Blaudeau, he was to be a kind of informer for the Constantinopolitan bishop with regard to the situation in the East, cf. Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 210. Differently, G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 490, stated that Acacius had relocated John to Tyre so that Calandion could take his place at Antioch. This thesis, however, assumes that John Codonatus had returned to the Antiochene see after the murder of Stephen in 479, which is not mentioned in the sources at all.

[86] *Gesta de nomine Acacii* 25, CA 99, 450-451. Cf. W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 181. In his letter, Acacius had also referred to the issue of John Codonatus.

synod at Laodicaea, summoned by the emperor, the events that happened later on, including the murder of Stephen by a hostile populace in March 479, are the evidence that Peter had still retained his influence at Antioch.[87]

Third episcopate

The second deposition of Peter the Fuller had seemed to finally seal his fate. Over a period of several years following the overthrow of Basiliscus' usurpation, Zeno and Acacius had pursued a definitely Chalcedonian course in politics, aiming to restore the status *ante* 475 in the Church. However, a sudden shift in the political situation had caused yet another turn in Peter's fate. At the beginning of 480s a growing hiatus between the emperor and Illus had become even more visible, with the latter becoming in fact the second most important figure of the state.[88] Preparing for a confrontation with the Isaurian nobleman, Zeno had been trying to gain a broad base of support among the population, including Egypt. However, that province had mostly sympathized with the adversaries of the Council of Chalcedon, in opposition to the Chalcedonian patriarch Timothy Salophakiolos and supporting the clandestine patriarch Peter Mongos – who was an opponent of the Council. In 482, taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by Timothy's death, the emperor Zeno had decided to make a compromise with the anti-Chalcedonians. He agreed to recognize Peter Mongos as legitimate patriarch on the condition that he would accept the Alexandrian Chalcedonians into the community, thus ending the split within the Egyptian Church, and sign a compromise document determining the fundamental conditions for establishing the communion between Alexandria and Constantinople, as contained in the imperial edict known as the *Henoticon*.[89] As soon as Peter

[87] Cf. *Theophanes* AM 5970 (considered to be an excerpt from Theodore Lector's *Epitome* 418) and AM 5973 (considered to be an excerpt from Theodore Lector's *Epitome* 421); *Synodicon Vetus* 102; *John of Nikiou* 88, 44; *Michael the Syrian* IX, 6, 149. Cf. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 489-490; A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 300 and Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 195.

[88] On Illus, see H. Elton, *Illus and the imperial aristocracy under Zeno*, Byzantion 70 (2000) 393-407; M. J. Leszka, *Illus Izauryjczyk wobec uzurpacji Bazyliskosa*, in: Acta Universitatis Lodziensis, Folia historica 80 (2005) 45-53. On the events before Illus' rebellion, see E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. II, *De la disparition de l'Empire d'Occident à la mort de Justinien (476-565)*, Paris – Bruxelles – Amsterdam 1949, 15-20.

[89] The text: Greek – E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, 52-54 (document no. 75); *Evagrius* III, 14; *Nikephorus Kallistus* XVI, 12 (reliant on Evagrius); A. Van Roey, *Le Monacensis Graecus 331 et la tradition manuscrite de l'Henotique de l'empereur Zénon*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica 31 (2000-2005) 105-108; Syriac translation – *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 8; *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, 230-234; Latin translation – *Liberatus* 17, 113-117; *Facundus of Hermiane, Pro defensione trium capitulorum* 12, 4; E. Schwartz, *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, 54-56. This document was composed, most probably, by Acacius, cf. *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 7; *Evagrius* III, 13; *John of Nikiou* 88, 62; *Theophanes* AM 5976. Acacius' authorship is generally accepted, cf.

Mongos had agreed to accept the conditions presented, Acacius established the communion with him.[90]

The patriarch of Antioch Calandion, however, had opposed to recognizing Peter Mongos. Moreover, after Illus' rebellion had broken out, he openly supported it, erasing the name of Zeno from the diptychs, which was tantamount to open declaration of disobedience to the emperor.[91] It is not surprising that after the swift defeat of Illus, Calandion was deposed and sent to exile at the Great Oasis in Egypt at the end of 484 or the beginning of 485.[92] However, before that had happened, his uncompromising stance towards the anti-Chalcedonians had led to the formation within the patriarchate of a strong opposition headed by a staunch enemy of Chalcedon, Philoxenus of Maboug. When Philoxenus had been banished by Calandion, he went on to organize further opposition against the bishop among the Mesopotamian monks and accused him of heresy before the emperor in Constantinople.[93]

In such an inflamed environment the emperor had to seek a more moderate figure, inclined to accept a compromise on the basis of the *Henoticon* of 482 and thus pacify the province. Despite the rebels' defeat, the political situation had not been entirely clear, as Illus and his closest supporters had retreated to Papirion, one of the Isaurian strongholds, where they put up resistance until 488.[94]

Zeno had decided to give his support to Peter the Fuller.[95] Most probably, one of the crucial reasons was the support from the local population

---

E. Schwartz, *Publizistische Sammlungen*, 197; W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 177; M. B. Leszka, *Między ortodoksją a monofizytyzmem. Obsada tronów patriarszych Konstantynopola, Aleksandrii, Antiochii i Jerozolimy w polityce cesarza Zenona*, Vox Patrum 18 (1998) 448; H. Ch. Brennecke, *Chalkedonense und Henotikon. Bemerkungen zur Prozeß der östlichen Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon*, in: Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität. Studien zur Rezeption der christologischen Formel von Chalkedon, herausgegeben von Johannes van Oort, J. Roldanus, Leuvain 1997, 42; P. Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus*, 131.

90 *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 7. 11-12; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 422-424; *Evagrius* III 16; *Theophanes* AM 5976; *Liberatus* 17, 112. Cf. H. Ch. Brennecke, *Chalkedonense und Henotikon*, 42.

91 *A Letter of Pope Gelasius to the Bishops of Dardania*, CA 95, 392. Cf. G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 496 and E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. II, 33.

92 *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 9; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 443; *Theophanes* AM 5982; *Evagrius* III 16; *Liberatus* 17, 125-126. Cf. also W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 181. On various proposals of dating Calandion's deposition, see M. B. Leszka, *Między ortodoksją a monofizytyzmem*, 450.

93 *Pseudo-Zacharias* VII, 10; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 444; *Theophanes* AM 5982. Cf. A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*, Louvain 1963, 31-39 and A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 301.

94 Cf. *Joshua Stylites* 17, 15-16; *John of Antioch*, fr. 306, 520-526. Cf. also E. W. Brooks, *The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians*, The English Historical Review 8 (1893) 227-228 and E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. II, 30-31.

95 Cf. *Theophanes* AM 5982 (considered to be an excerpt from Theodore Lector's *Epitome* 443); *Evagrius* III, 16; *John Malalas* XV, 6; *Synodicon Vetus* 105; *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 112; *Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita Sabae* 32; *John of Nikiou* 88, 63; *Chronicon Iacobi Edesseni*, 235. *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan*, 421 writes that Zeno had consulted

that he had received, mentioned by Pseudo-Zacharias and confirmed by the existence of the opposition, associated with him, against the city's Chalcedonian bishops.[96] His return to the Antiochene see and the acclamation by the synod of the East had taken place in 485.[97] His actions aiming to establish a relative equilibrium in the Antiochene Church, based upon the *Henoticon* compromise, had encountered rather negative responses from both groups. On the one hand, he had pacified Philoxenus' actions by elevating him to the bishop of Hierapolis/Maboug;[98] on the other, he deposed many bishops, most likely Illus' supporters, though the Chalcedonian sources tend to emphasize their affinity with Chalcedon. They were: Nestor of Tarsus, Kyros of Hierapolis, John of Kyrestai, Romanus of Chalcedon, Eusebius of Samosata, Julian of Mopsuestia, Paul of Constantina, Manos of Hemeria, and Andrew of Theodosioupolis.[99]

It is very difficult, therefore, to determine the actual position of Peter the Fuller with regard to the Council of Chalcedon. It is beyond doubt that upon signing the *Encyclical* of Basiliscus and acceding, for the third time, to the see, Peter had issued an anathema against the Council of Chalcedon,[100] yet for radical anti-Chalcedonians his stance, especially towards the end of his life, raised some considerable doubts.[101] Perhaps, the reason for this distrust was Peter's acceptance of the *Henoticon*, which was considered to be a crypto-Chalcedonian document by the radical

"all the bishops" about his decision. Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 220 says that Peter was Zeno's candidate, whereas Acacius wished that John Codonatus would be appointed.

[96] Cf. *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 9-10. Cf. also A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 303. W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 175 says that Zeno's approval of Peter the Fuller had been necessary in order to restore harmony in the Antiochene Church, and it resulted from Peter's popularity among the inhabitants of the city.

[97] For the question of dating, see Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 220.

[98] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 444; *Theophanes* AM 5982; *Synodicon Vetus* 105. On Philoxenus, see especially A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog*. Hierapolis was a strongly Chalcedonian metropolitan see, cf. W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 188-189.

[99] *Theophanes* AM 5982 (supplemented with the Latin version). Cf. W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 188; P. T. R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon*, 33 and Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 220, who are convinced that the reasons for the above-mentioned bishops' depositions were religious rather than political. Differently, G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 496 writes that we do not know anything about any instances of Chalcedonians being persecuted by Peter.

[100] Cf. *Victor of Tunnuna*, s.a. 485, who writes that Peter had rejected Chalcedon, while s.a. 487 describes Peter as: *chalcedonensis synodi inimicus*, *Laudatio S. Barnabae*, 110, in turn, mentions that he had openly condemned the Council of Chalcedon.

[101] See *John Rufus, Plerophoriae* 22, 49 and *A Letter of Severus of Antioch to Ammonios*, 254-256, in which the author reproached Peter for his communion with Chalcedonians. Cf. also A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 301-302.

opponents of the Council.[102] We should bear in mind that Peter Mongos had to face similar allegations from radical anti-Chalcedonians. The synodal letter of 485, the only extant document authored by Peter,[103] evades any Christological formulations, concentrating on proving the conformity of the *Henoticon* with Church orthodoxy, emphasizing above all its anti-Nestorian character by recognizing Cyril's anathemas as well as the conformity of the document with the Creed of the Council of Nicaea, as confirmed by the Councils of Constantinople (381) and Ephesus (431).[104] And even though the tradition connected with Theodore Lector states that during the synod Peter had explicitly excommunicated the Council of Chalcedon, the afore-mentioned synodal letter does not include such a condemnation.[105] It appears, therefore, that he was a staunch adversary of Nestorianism and a moderate opponent of the Council of Chalcedon, who could be satisfied with the compromise represented by the *Henoticon* without the necessity of explicitly excommunicating the assembly of the bishops in 451.[106]

After his return in 485 to the Antiochene see Peter was to remove from the text of the *Trishagion* hymn the expression "O Christ the King", added by Calandion to the hymn in order to avoid the Theopaschite overtone of Peter's earlier addition, causing once again a wave of tumult.[107] It seems therefore that the primary characteristic of Peter the Fuller's religious policy was that particular innovation. Does it mean, however, that he advocated Theopaschite or Apollinarian views? The *Trishagion* doxology was regarded as either a hymn addressed to Christ or the Trinity.[108] At

---

[102] Cf. R. Kosiński, *Kilka uwag o Henotikonie i domniemanym zwrocie w polityce religijnej cesarza Zenona*, (forthcoming); likewise, E. Schwartz, *Johannes Rufus, ein monophysitischer Schrifsteller*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 16 Abhandlung, Heidelberg 1912, 16-17.

[103] Cf. K.-H. Uthemann, *Petros der Walker*, col. 143. However, Aloys Grillmeier is of the opinion that the synodal letter was not written by Peter and it reflects not so much his own views as those of the assembled bishops, cf. A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 296.

[104] Cf. G. Fritz, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1934. The content of the synodal letter of the assembly that approved Peter's third election in: *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 10.

[105] Cf. *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 443; *Theophanes* AM 5982; *Synodicon Vetus* 105; *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 10. Cf. also Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 231, note 755.

[106] Cf. A. de Halleux, *Philoxène de Mabbog*, 34 and A. Grillmeier – T. Hainthaler, *Jesus der Christus*, 302. P. T. R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon*, 23, expresses the view that the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon were unacceptable for Peter as they seemed to him the triumph of Nestorianism. Ph. Blaudeau, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 231 considers him to be moderate in matters of doctrine, while M. van Esbroeck, *The Memra on the Parrot*, 469 regards Peter as an opportunist.

[107] Cf. *Theophanes* AM 5982; *John Diacrinomenos, Epitome* 545. On the introduction of Calandion's addition, *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 427.

[108] The *Trishagion* dates back to the tenure of Proclus, bishop of Constantinople in the years 434-447, and is related to the earthquake of 446 at the capital. During

Antioch, the Christological interpretation of the hymn prevailed. To the words "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us" Peter had added, after the word "Immortal", the words "who was crucified for us". He had done so in all probability precisely to reinforce the Christological interpretation of the hymn by stressing that the Logos had truly incarnated and suffered.[109]

However, those who believed that the *Trishagion* is addressed to the entire Holy Trinity were shocked at the innovation added by Peter, which unequivocally suggested that the impassible God had suffered.[110] In order to avoid such a heretical interpretation, Calandion added the words "O Christ the King" to the doxology, so that it would be obvious that the expression "who was crucified for us" referred only to the second Person of the Holy Trinity. Therefore, Peter's removal of Calandion's addition had been considered as an open introduction of the Theopaschite interpretation of the hymn by Peter the Fuller.[111] However, not all of the adherents of the Christological interpretation had accepted Calandion's correction. For instance, in his letter to the monks of Teleda, Philoxenus of Maboug had regarded Calandion's addition as a Nestorian intrusion going so far as to introduce the fourth Person of God.[112] A similar accusation is expressed by Isaac of Antioch in his poem on a parrot reciting the *Trishagion* in Peter's version.[113] We cannot therefore explicitly determine if it was Peter the Fuller's intention to show his support for the Theopaschite interpretation of the doxology.[114]

---

one of the services celebrated in public, the words of the hymn were to be revealed to a little boy. On the *Trishagion*, see especially V. S. JANERAS, *Les byzantines et le trishagion christologique*, in: Miscellanea liturgica in onore de Cardinale Giacomo Lercaro, vol. II, Rome 1957, 469-499; S. BROCK, *The thrice-holy hymn in the liturgy*, Sobornost. Eastern Christian Review 7 (1985) 24-34; K. GINTER, *Spór o Trisagion*, in: Res Historica 14, Graecorum et Romanorum memoria II, ed. L. Morawiecki, Lublin 2002, 221-231 and A. LOUTH, *Trishagion*, in: Theologische Realenzyklopädie, Band 34, Berlin 2002, 121-124.

109 Cf. A. LOUTH, *Denys the Areopagite*, London 2002, 9-10; B. VARGHESE, *West Syrian Liturgical Theology*, London 2004, 69; P. ALLEN – C. T. R. HAYWARD, *Severus of Antioch*, London 2004, 9.

110 Cf. G. FRITZ, *Pierre le Foulon*, col. 1935.

111 Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór o Trisagion*, 228, though the author is mistaken in his assumption that the original version of the elaborated hymn was identical with Calandion's version.

112 *Philoxenus, A Letter to the Monks of Teleda*, p. 496. See also A. DE HALLEUX, *Philoxène de Mabbog*, 194-195. Paradoxically, Peter was accused of introducing the fourth Person to the Trinity by John of Damascus in his *Expositio Fidei*, cf. *John of Damascus, Expositio Fidei* 54, 1.

113 The text in: G. S. BICKELL, *S. Isaaci Antiocheni Doctoris Syrarum Opera omnia*, pars I, Gießen 1873, 84-89. The allegation of introducing an idol, the fourth Person, into the Trinity by Calandion's addition, especially in the verses 207-210. Cf. also A. I. BARSOUM, *The Scattered Pearls. A History of Syriac Literature and Sciences*, trans. by M. Moosa, Piscataway 2003, 246-247.

114 Cf. W. H. C. FREND, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 168, who notes that the hymn with Peter's addition had become a touchstone of the Monophysite orthodoxy.

The issue of the *Trishagion* had been indeed the core of the conflicts at Antioch, in which Peter the Fuller got involved. The significance of the question can be seen in the light of the afore-mentioned Syrian poem by Isaac of Antioch, describing a man who had taught his parrot to recite the *Trishagion* in Peter's version, to test the resistance of those who were against the formula. The poem was written probably towards the end of Calandion's episcopate.[115] It mentions bloody riots that erupted in connection with the controversy over Calandion's addition, attacking the latter, and Diphysites in general, while sympathizing with Peter, without mentioning his name anywhere in the poem.

The third episcopate of Peter the Fuller is also connected with other liturgical innovations attributed to him. Theodore Lector writes that he had introduced the recitation of the Nicene Creed at each Eucharist, which made it, and not the Chalcedonian definitions, the standard of orthodoxy.[116] The change may be linked to the *Henoticon*, whose formula of compromise had been based exactly on that Creed, which would suggest that it had taken place during Peter's third episcopate.[117] The reforms that Peter was to introduce into the liturgy also included, according to Theodore, consecrating the oil in front of the audience of believers, reciting an epiclesis over the baptismal water at the eve of the Epiphany as well as saying an invocation to *Theotokos* in each prayer.[118]

In his *Laudatio* in honour of St Barnabas, Alexander the Monk writes that Peter wished to re-establish the authority of the Antiochene see over the Church of Cyprus.[119] The author says that in order to strengthen this claim the archbishop had raised, first of all, the argument of the apostleship of the Church of Antioch and pointed out the fact that Christianity in Cyprus had originated from the city on the Orontes. Cypriot bishop

---

[115] Cf. M. van Esbroeck, *The Memra on the Parrot,* 469.

[116] Cf. A. Louth, *Denys the Areopagite,* 9.

[117] Although Bernard Capelle recognized that the introduction of the Nicene Creed into the liturgy can be convincingly linked only with the patriarch of Constantinople Timothy, who had introduced it into the Eucharist around the year 515, it pertains, however, to the liturgy of the Church of Constantinople, not of Antioch. Cf. B. Capelle, *L' Introduction du symbole à la messe*, in: Mélanges Joseph de Ghellinck, vol. II, Gemboux 1951, 1003-1007. We do not know whether Timothy had followed the example of Peter's reform, as suggested by Henryk Paprocki, cf. W. Hryniewicz – K. Karski – H. Paprocki, *Credo. Symbol naszej wiary,* Kraków 2009, 27 and R. Taft, *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and other Pre-anaphoral Rites,* Roma 1978, 396-405. According to L. Perrone, *Pietro il Fullone,* col. 2794 the liturgical modifications had been introduced by Peter the Fuller during his second episcopate.

[118] *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 428; *John Diacrinomenos, Epitome* 547; *Nikephorus Kallistus* XV, 28. Cf. G. Fritz, *Pierre le Foulon,* col. 1935 and G. Wagner, *Poświęcenie myronu,* Wiadomości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego 19 (1989) 35-36.

[119] *Laudatio S. Barnabae,* 112-118; *Theodore Lector, Epitome* 436; *Cedrenus, Compendium Historiarum,* 618-619 and *Nikephorus Kallistus* XIV, 37. Peter's action towards the Church of Cyprus is dated to his third episcopate, cf. G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus,* vol. I, *To the Conquest by Richard Lion Heart,* Cambridge 1940, 276.

Anthemios' discovery of the grave of the Apostle Barnabas near Salamis, proving that the Church of Cyprus had its own apostolic roots, was to weaken Peter's argumentation and finally contribute to the emperor Zeno's dismissal of Peter the Fuller's claim.[120] This account had become deeply entrenched in the Cypriot tradition, which accepted that the Church of Cyprus owed its autocephalia to the emperor Zeno's intervention.[121]

John Malalas, in his chronicle, mentions that towards the end of Zeno's reign, that is during the episcopate of Peter the Fuller or his successor, some violent riots broke out at Antioch leading to acts of aggression against the Jews living in the city: many of them were killed, the synagogue of Asabinus was burned down, bodies of the dead were desecrated (unearthed and burned) by the mob.[122] No account, however, states that the bishop may have been involved in those events, whereas Ernest Stein's thesis that the Jews, along with the Blue faction and pagans, had supported Illus' rebellion may prove that the incidents in question were still connected with the year 484.[123]

In spite of the support from the population of Antioch, Peter had not been accepted by all the Churches. Although Peter Mongos and Martyrius of Jerusalem established the communion with him, the patriarch of Constantinople Acacius had not been inclined to do so.[124] The news of Calandion's deposition and taking over of the Antiochene see by Peter the Fuller, as well as calls from Chalcedonians in the province Syria II, had led Rome into a stark response. At the Rome synod in October 485 Pope Felix III had effected yet another excommunication of Peter the Fuller.[125]

---

[120] On the discovery of the Apostle Barnaba's grave, see also *Victor of Tunnuna,* s.a. 488.1.

[121] See in particular G. HILL, *A History of Cyprus*, 276-279 and A. N. MITSIDES, *Τό αὐτοκέφαλον τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Κύπρου*, in: XV^e Congrès international d'études byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports, V, 2, Chypre dans le monde byzantine, Athènes 1976, 3-18, especially 4-5. Cf. also G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 496-497 and A. GRILLMEIER – T. HAINTHALER, *Jesus der Christus*, 301.

[122] Cf. *John Malalas* XV, 15. It appears that those incidents were related to the conflicts between the circus factions. However, the Slavic translation of Malalas mentions that the figure behind the anti-Jewish tumults was a certain monk who had locked himself in one of the towers of the city's south wall, from where he encouraged the populace to attack the Jews, whose synagogue was nearby, see *Chronika Joanna Malaly w slavyanskom perevode*, 11. Cf. also G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 497-499.

[123] Cf. E. STEIN*, Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. II, 32.

[124] *Pseudo-Zacharias* V, 10. Cf. also Ph. BLAUDEAU, *Alexandrie et Constantinople*, 220-222 – in the French scholar's opinion, Acacius had refused to recognize Peter, which is indicated by the absence of any mention in the papal sources from the 490s about the communion between Peter the Fuller and Acacius, signs of improving relations between the latter and the Chalcedonian monks of Constantinople and attributing to him the authorship of one of the apocryphal letters to Peter concerning the *Trishagion.* One should remember, however, that in 485 the synod at Rome had assigned the initiative in elevating Peter to Acacius, cf. *Letter of the Rome Synod of 5 October 485*, CA 70, 157.

[125] Cf. *Letter of the Roman Synod of 5 October 485*, CA 70, 155-161; *Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita Sabae* 32; *Synodicon Vetus* 106-107. Cf. also W. H. C. FREND, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 181-182 and 186.

Despite this situation, Peter was to continue at the see of Antioch until his death in, probably, 488.[126]

Summary

In the 460s, Peter the Fuller was the head of one of the Constantinopolitan monasteries, perhaps the monastery at the Church of St Bassa at Chalcedon. Expelled from that monastery, he went to Antioch, where he acceded three times to the office of bishop, however performing the episcopal duties for a period of no more than five years altogether. His first episcopate began probably at the end of 470 or the beginning of 471, and lasted until the spring of 471; the second one from the summer of 475 until the summer/autumn of 476; and the third one from the beginning of 485 until his death. In his public activity, he was known as an ardent adversary of Nestorianism and a liturgical reformer. His lasting legacy became his innovative addition to the *Trishagion* doxology, which had soon turned into a watchword for the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon. Peter the Fuller himself, however, does not seem to be an explicit adversary of Chalcedon, being more of a moderate opponent ready to accept the compromise as provided by the *Henoticon*. The second and third episcopates of Peter were impacted by political issues, even though his generally assumed close relations with Zeno of Isauria appear to have been deliberately overstated by Theodore Lector, who was distinctly ill-disposed towards Zeno.

[126] *Victor of Tunnuna,* s.a. 488.3. Theophanes dates Peter's death to the year 5983 since the Creation, which corresponds to AD 490-491. Cf. also *Chronicon ad annum Domini 846 pertinens*, 166 and *Agapius, Kitab al-Unvan*, 421 saying that the period of his last episcopate was to be 5 years long, which indicates the year 489/490. Cf. also *Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum*, 171. Cf. G. DOWNEY, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 507-508, note 19 and W. H. C. FREND, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 190.